



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/996,713

11/30/2001

Cha-Bong Choi

P-0289

3691

34610 7590 09/19/2008

KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP  
P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200

EXAMINER

CZEKAJ, DAVID J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/19/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/996,713	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHOI, CHA-BONG	
	<b>Examiner</b> DAVID CZEKAJ	<b>Art Unit</b> 2621	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-18 and 26-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-18 and 26-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/2/08 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

On page 11, applicant argues that Irube fails to disclose detecting the compass orientation direction data associated with an image located in a direction of the camera. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner relied upon Rossi, not Irube, to teach this limitation. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

On page 11, applicant argues that Irube fails to disclose multiplex/demultiplexing voice, video, and direction or other data. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. See for example Irube figure 1. There Irube discloses multiplexing/demultiplexing voice, video, and direction or other data via a multiplexer/demultiplexer. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

On page 11, applicant argues that Irube fails to disclose the display module. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner relied upon Irube to teach a generic display, however, relied upon Berstis, not

Irube, to teach the specifics of the display module. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

On page 11, applicant argues that Rossi fails to disclose the direction sensor as claimed. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. See for example Rossi column 3, lines 55-60 and column 4, lines 1-36. There Rossi discloses using latitude, longitude, and altitude headings, an AMS sensor, and a GPS sensor, to determine the compass orientation direction associated with an object. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

On page 12, applicant argues that Berstis fails to disclose determining the position of the object. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner relied upon Rossi, not Berstis, to teach the claimed limitation. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

On pages 12, applicant argues that Berstis fails to disclose checking a direction mode and subsequently displaying the image data. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. See for example Berstis figures 3A-3B and column 6, lines 16-37. There Berstis discloses checking whether the position mode has been selected. The position mode, or direction displaying mode, upon selection, will display the image and direction data to a user. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

On page 13, applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Irube, Rossi, Berstis, and Rudow. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion

Art Unit: 2621

to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Berstis teaches in column 1, lines 47-53, that GPS receivers are a cost prohibitive way of determining the position and time information of an object. Rossi teaches in column 1, lines 17-31, that prior art object identification systems failed to provide precise location information. Rudow teaches in figure 12 and column 61, lines 55-65 that having the direction, or position, of a golfer on one side of the screen enables more information to be displayed elsewhere. Since the references contain similar subject matter and are within similar fields of endeavor, the combination is deemed proper. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, and 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irube et al. (2001/0041586), (hereinafter referred to as "Irube") in

view of Rossi et al. (5672820), (hereinafter referred to as "Rossi") in further view of Berstis (6542824).

Regarding claim 1, Irube discloses a communication terminal apparatus combined with a handset with high probability (Irube: paragraph 0001, lines 1-3). This apparatus comprises a "codec for performing converting operation between analogue voice data and digital voice data" (Irube: figure 1, item 23, wherein the voice codec is the codec), "camera module connected to a camera installed within the mobile terminal for performing converting operation between analogue image data and digital image data" (Irube: figure 1, items 4 and 25), "voice/image communication apparatus for multiplexing or demultiplexing the converted voice, image, direction data, and frame" (Irube: figure 1, items 17 and 20, wherein the multiplexer/demultiplexer are part of the communication apparatus, paragraph 0113, lines 1-4, wherein the frame is a combination of the voice, video, and direction or other data), "LCD module for displaying image and direction data" (Irube: figure 1, items 14, 16, and 28, wherein the camera direction sensor unit provides the direction data and the video encoder provides the image data), "a speaker" (Irube: figure 2) and a "control unit for controlling each unit generally" (Irube: figure 1, item 11). Although Irube fails to show a direction sensor for detecting the compass orientation direction of a photographing object and displaying the direction data within the LCD, Irube does show a camera direction sensor unit (Irube: figure 1, item 28) for detecting the presence of the camera (Irube: paragraph 0047, lines 18-19). Rossi teaches

that angles, compass headings (or compass orientation), and GPS coordinates, along with a camera, can be used to determine the objects location or direction (Rossi: column 4, lines 1-36). Berstis teaches that GPS receivers are a cost prohibitive way of determining the position and time information of an object (Berstis: column 1, lines 47-53). To overcome this problem, Berstis discloses an apparatus that determines and subsequently displays the compass orientation direction without using a GPS receiver (Berstis: column 1, lines 57-60, column 6, lines 57-61). Berstis further discloses "checking whether a direction displaying mode has been selected and controls the display module to display the demultiplexed image and direction data" (Berstis: figures 3A-3B; column 6, lines 15-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the camera direction sensor unit disclosed by Irube with the angle, compass, and GPS coordinates taught by Rossi, and add the direction displaying taught by Berstis, in order to obtain an apparatus that more precisely and cost effectively locates and displays the direction of an object. Further, one would be motivated to do so since Irube is silent as to how the object location is determined.

Regarding claim 3, see the examiners comments for claim 1 and note that in the combination of Irube and Rossi as applied to claim 1, Irube discloses a "voice encoding processing unit for encoding the voice data input from the codec or converting the voice data into data for transmitting to a speaker" (Irube: figure 1, items 23 and 27, wherein the video encoder receives and encodes the voice

data from the voice codec, item 2, wherein the voice data is transmitted to the handset, which contains a speaker), “image encoding processing unit for encoding the image data” (Irube: figure 1, item 27, wherein the image encoder is the video encoder), and “multiplexing unit for multiplexing the voice, image, and direction data” (Irube: figure 1, items 17 and 20). Rossi discloses “encoding the direction data” (Rossi: figure 5, item 30, wherein the direction data is obtained from the angular measuring system and the receiving module).

Regarding claim 4, Rossi discloses “calculating the compass orientation direction and encodes calculated compass orientation direction by formatting the orientation direction into a binary value” (Rossi: column 4, lines 20-36, wherein the angle is composed of the three angles  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$ , figure 2, item 30, wherein the encoder encodes the angle and direction data, column 3, lines 32-46, wherein the digital value produced by the digital quartz inertial measurement unit represents the binary value, figure 3, item 66, wherein the compass heading is the compass orientation direction).

Regarding claim 6, Rossi discloses “displaying a direction on the screen” (Rossi: figure 5, item 48, wherein the display displays the direction).

Regarding claim 7, although not shown, it would have been obvious to display the direction on the screen in the form of a compass (Official Notice). Doing so would have been obvious to make the direction easier to view and read.

Regarding claim 8, see the examiners comments for claim 1 and note that in the combination of Irube and Rossi as applied to claim 1, Irube discloses that



the “multiplexing unit multiplexes the encoded packet data and compass orientation direction data by receiving data from the voice, image, and direction units and inputs the data to the image frame by forming a flag and header” (Irube: figure 1, items 27, 28, 23, 17, and 20, wherein the multiplexer multiplexes data from the video encoder, voice codec, and camera direction unit, figure 12 and paragraph 0039, line 7, wherein the voice/video conversation appears to be in the flag/header format which would comply with the MPEG 4 standards disclosed by Irube. Had Irube and Rossi been combined as disclosed above, Rossi would supply the compass orientation data to be multiplexed, wherein the compass orientation data is the compass heading).

Regarding claims 26-31, note the examiners rejection for claims 1, 3, and 4.

3. Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irube et al. (2001/0041586), (hereinafter referred to as “Irube”) in view of Rossi et al. (5672820), (hereinafter referred to as “Rossi”) in further view of Berstis (6542824) in further view of Takahashi et al. (6516094), (hereinafter referred to as “Takahashi”).

Regarding claims 9 and 11, note the examiners rejection for claims 1 and 19, and in addition, claims 9 and 11 differ from claims 1 and 19 in that claims 9 and 11, further require the formation of null data. Takahashi teaches that when a reference region is not described, i.e. no information/data is contained on the reference region to transmit, null data is formed and inserted into the description region (Takahashi: figure 5d, column 6, lines 55-61). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the camera direction sensor unit disclosed by Irube with the angle, compass, and GPS coordinates taught by Rossi, add the direction displaying taught by Berstis, and add the formation of null data taught by Takahashi in order to obtain an apparatus that more precisely locates the direction of an object. Further, one would be motivated to do so since Irube is silent as to how the object location is determined.

4. Claims 5, 10, and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irube et al. (2001/0041586), (hereinafter referred to as "Irube") in view of Rossi et al. (5672820), (hereinafter referred to as "Rossi") in further view of Berstis (6542824) in further view of Rudow et al. (6236940), (hereinafter referred to as "Rudow").

Regarding claim 5, note the examiners rejection for claims 1 and 19, and in addition, claim 5 differs from claims 1 and 19 in that claim 5 further requires having a displaying area on one side of the screen. Rudow teaches that having the direction, or position, of a golfer on one side of the screen enables more information to be displayed elsewhere (Rudow: figure 12, column 61, lines 55-65, wherein having the golfers direction displayed in the corner of the screen enables the hole information to be displayed as well, as opposed to having the golfers position take up the entire screen). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the camera direction sensor unit disclosed by Irube with the angle,

compass, and GPS coordinates taught by Rossi, add the direction displaying taught by Berstis, and add the display means taught by Rudow in order to obtain an apparatus that more precisely locates and displays the direction of an object. Further, one would be motivated to do so since Irube is silent as to how the object location is determined.

Regarding claims 10 and 12, note the examiners rejection for claims 1 and 5, and in addition, Irube in view of Rossi in further view of Berstis in further view of Rudow disclose "detecting the data demultiplexed image and direction data and transmitting to the displaying unit" (Irube: figure 1, paragraph 0113), "checking for a direction displaying mode" (Rudow: figure 6, wherein the list of menu choices on the right, i.e. 1-9, sets the hole to be displayed), "determining the position and method in displaying the direction and image data on the LCD if direction mode is set" (Rudow: figures 6 and 20, wherein the position is determined with the aid of GPS data, column 4, lines 1-3), "displaying the direction and image on the LCD" (Rudow: figures 6 and 20) and "displaying the compass orientation data within the image on the screen of the LCD, the compass orientation direction data being associated with a direction of the image, the image being located in a photographing direction of the camera" (Berstis: column 6, lines 50-67, wherein the compass orientation data is the arrow and compass points).

Regarding claim 13, Rudow discloses "the LCD displays only image data read from the voice/image communication apparatus if the direction displaying

mode is not set” (Rudow: figure 13, wherein the image communication apparatus is the box 18 which includes a video controller, column 10, lines 34-38, wherein pop up windows or other various messages are displayed on the screen, column 4, lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 14, Rudow discloses having “a direction displaying area at one side of the screen” (Rudow: figure 20, wherein the direction displaying area is the left/center of the screen which shows the direction of the hole).

Regarding claim 15, Rossi discloses “displaying a direction on the screen” (Rossi: figure 5, item 48, wherein the display displays the direction).

Regarding claims 16, although not shown, it would have been obvious to display the direction on the screen in the form of a compass (Official Notice). Doing so would have been obvious to make the direction easier to view and read.

Regarding claim 17, Irube discloses “displaying comprises a transmitted stop image” (Irube: figure 12, wherein the End Negotiation frame is the stop image).

Regarding claim 18, Rudow and Berstis disclose “the LCD further displays time and date information with the image and compass orientation data” (Rudow: figure 20, column 5, lines 62-64, wherein it is determined, from the GPS satellites, the dates of the games played, column 4, lines 1-3; Berstis: column 6, lines 57-61).

5. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irube et al. (2001/0041586), (hereinafter referred to as “Irube”) in view of Rossi et al. (5672820),

(hereinafter referred to as "Rossi") in further view of Berstis (6542824) in further view of Vance et al. (6992699).

Regarding claim 32, note the examiners rejection for claim 1, and in addition, claim 32 differs from claim 1 in that claim 32 further requires displaying on the screen of a camera phone. Vance teaches displaying information on camera phones (Vance: figures 1-3; column 3, lines 6-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the display on the camera phone taught by Vance in order to obtain a more versatile apparatus by being able to view the display in a plurality of different places via the use of a camera phone.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID CZEKAJ whose telephone number is (571)272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dave Czekaj/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621